



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,017	11/21/2003	Jonathon Fischer	03-1052	2784
20306	7590	07/12/2004	EXAMINER BAHTA, KIDEST	
MCDONNELL BOEHNEN HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP 300 S. WACKER DRIVE 32ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT 2125	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/720,017	FISCHER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kidest Bahta	2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjornson et al. (U. S. Patent 6,173,210) in view of Salvo et al. (U.S. patent 6,341,271).

Regarding claims 1-32, Bjornson discloses a configuring subsystem for designing (Fig. 2B, step 28) and ordering (Fig. 2B, step 52); using one or more customer defined parameters (Fig. 2A, step 21) and one or more manufacture process determined parameters to generate a designed system (Fig. 2A, step 27), the configuring and processing subsystem communicate with the business subsystem (Fig. 2A), configuring subsystem for determined cost and schedule of the configured system (Fig. 3B), a computerized manufacturing subsystem in communication with the configuring subsystem and the business subsystem to manufacture the configured system (Fig. 3B, step 82), the processing system generates drawings for the designed system (Fig. 3B, step 79), the configuring subsystem provides for verification of the designed system (Fig. 3B, step 80); placing and removing the components in inventory (Fig. 24A).

Bjornson fails to disclose computer network for manufacturing injection-molding systems and the configuring subsystem is in communication with a web page server and computer network, the network is the internet.

However, Salvo discloses computer network for manufacturing injection molding systems (column 4, lines 3-10) and the configuring subsystem is in communication with a web page server and computer network (Fig. 2 and 3), the network is the internet (column 7, line 55 - column 8, line 8).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to modify the teachings of Bjornson with the teachings of Salvo in order to reduce the time required to determine the status of devices couples to controller and data communication with a controller with significantly sacrificing error detection performance.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,055. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claimed invention is fully disclosed in the patent.

Regarding claims 1-20, are fully discloses in claims 1-31 of the patent. The difference between the claimed system and the system in the patent is that the claims in patent is more detail, however all the limitations of claimed system is discloses in the patent.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
6. Any inquiry concerning communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Kidest Bahta, whose telephone number is (703) 308-6103. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached (703) 308-0538. Additionally, the fax phone for Art Unit 2125 is (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Kidest Bahta
July 8, 2004

